

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,089	02/27/2004	Masaaki Kojima	248743US90DIV	4285	
	7590 11/06/200 AK, MCCLELLAND	EXAM	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		MERKLING, MATTHEW J			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/06/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/787,089	KOJIMA, MASAAKI	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MATTHEW J. MERKLING	1795	

	MATTHEW J. MERKLING	1795					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
 N The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
 The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la 	e period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as				
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
AMENDMENTS							
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); 							
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	l be entered and an e	xplanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	hefore or on the date of filing a No	tion of Annual will no	be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. 🔲 Other:							
/Alexa D. Neckel/	/M. J. M./						
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795	Examiner, Art Unit 1795						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Examiner, Art Unit 1795

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 3, Applicant argues that Kumagai fails to teach a processing means for making a comparison of the temperature in the temperature in the temperature in the examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument. As stated in the previous office action, the 'filter accumulation amount detection function' described in ool. 5 lines 18-34 of Kumagai, discloses that the temperature sile detecting means in the casing (which corresponds to the temperature sile temperatures will be equal) and the temperature detecting means of the exhaust gas (which corresponds to the temperature upstream of the casing) are used to calculate the accumulation amount. As such, since these two temperatures are used to calculate the flow rate of the exhaust gas, they are inherently compared to determine the operation of the switching means. In other words, the flow rate is based on a comparison of the temperature in the casing and a temperature upstream of the casing, and in turn, the flow rate is used to determine the switching means peration.

On page 4, Applicant argues that Kumagai fails to teach processing means for operating the switching means based on the comparison and preheating the filter with exhaust gas. The examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument for the reasons stated above. Furthermore it is noted that the examiner interpreted the phrase "preheating the filter with exhaust gas." as an independent illinitation. As claimed, there is nothing that the iste the "preheating the filter with exhaust gas." The operation of the switching means, as Applicant arques.